

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/501,627	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GUILLARME ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hal I. Kaplan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2836	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Hal I. Kaplan. (3) Kristy J. Downing.  
 (2) Robert DeBeradinis. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 08 August 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 3.


Identification of prior art discussed: Mitchell, Gauthier.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

 10/29/07  
 MICHAEL SHERRY  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants argued that there was no motivation to combine Mitchell with the other cited references because Mitchell is drawn to an AC/DC converter and not a DC/DC converter, and the cited diode does not provide the protection function of the claimed invention. Examiner respectfully disagreed and argued that whether the converter is an AC/DC or DC/DC converter makes no difference because it is the teaching and not the entire reference that is combined, and the diode of Mitchell performs the same function as the diode of the claimed invention - blocking reverse current flow when the FET opens.